

The Sun

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1910.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
 DAILY, Per Month \$0.50
 DAILY, Per Year \$5.00
 SUNDAY, Per Year \$2.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year \$7.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month \$0.70

Postage to foreign countries added.
 All checks, money orders, A. C. to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau Street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President of the Association, EDWARD P. MICHOD, 170 Nassau Street, Treasurer of the Association, M. J. LAFAN, 170 Nassau Street, Secretary of the Association, D. W. QUINN, 170 Nassau Street.

London office, 11, Abchurch Lane, 1, Strand, London. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11, Abchurch Lane, 1, Strand, London. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale in London at the American and Colonial Exchange, 11, Abchurch Lane, 1, Strand, London.

Paris office, 32, rue de la Harpe, 32, Paris. The daily and Sunday Sun are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel, Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, Kiosque 13, Boulevard de la Madeleine, Kiosque 14, Boulevard de la Madeleine, Kiosque 15, Boulevard de la Madeleine.

If any friends who have sent us manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must enclose a check and stamp for that purpose.

Beverly at This Date.

Reports that represent Mr. TART as on his way to the public waiting place, on account of the amazing exhibition of old friendship's disloyalty which the country has recently witnessed, should be received with caution.

The same remark applies to reports that represent the President as more or less intimidated by the resonance of an all pervading voice.

We have yet to be convinced that Mr. TART is either sored or scared.

A Plain Question and a Fair Question.

"Shaking his clenched fists in the air with even more than customary eagerness," Colonel ROOSEVELT is reported as saying at Riverhead.

I have noticed a good deal of comment on my speech on New Nationalism. All that New Nationalism means is the application of certain old time morality to the changed conditions of the day. I wish to see greater governmental efficiency because we have to deal with greater but less efficiency. That is my whole creed. There is no revolution in it.

As we have pointed out to Colonel ROOSEVELT more than once, there is or there is not revolution in his New Nationalism according to the method he proposes for its promotion.

If his idea is to increase governmental efficiency and to apply old time morality to the changed conditions of the day by the regular process of constitutional amendment he is within his rights as a law abiding citizen. There is no revolution in a new nationalism by that process realized. His programme is entitled to respect even when acquiescence is withheld.

But if the New Nationalism so vociferously but so vaguely proclaimed is to be brought into being by avoiding the prescribed course of constitutional amendment and by adopting the expedients too plainly indicated in some of Colonel ROOSEVELT's utterances, for example, as he said at Harnsburg, "through Executive action, through legislation and through judicial interpretation and construction of law," then there is nothing but revolution in Colonel ROOSEVELT's project.

You cannot increase the constitutional powers of the Federal Government one-millionth of a line by Executive action. You can increase governmental activity, but you cannot by statutory legislation increase governmental power in a single particular beyond the limits which the Constitution now imposes. You cannot by judicial interpretation and construction at the dictation of orators and applauding crowds write into the Constitution one power now reserved to the people unless the Supreme Court prostitutes itself to mob opinion and abandons the very function which was constituted to fulfil.

Instead of maintaining his ominous silence about the method by which his New Nationalism purposes to accomplish radical changes in our system of government, why not let Colonel ROOSEVELT cease to speak fog and cant, to the immense apprehension of the soberer part of the community, long enough to answer specifically this one question?

Does New Nationalism intend to submit its metamorphosing ideas to the States for ratification in the manner prescribed by Article V. of the Old Nationalism's Constitution? Otherwise it inevitably means revolution, notwithstanding Colonel ROOSEVELT's excited denials that there is revolution in it.

The question is plain. It likewise seems to THE SUN to be perfectly fair.

Cole Blease.

The Hon. COLE L. BLEASE, [pronounced "Blaze"], Mayor of Newberry, has at last sent the "better element" of South Carolina to grass. The Democratic primaries have spoken Mr. BLEASE will be the next Governor, a job he has sought many a time and oft.

We are surprised but not unmitigably pained by this triumph. So far as our imperfect vision could take note of Palmetto things, Mr. BLEASE was and long has been opposed by everybody, at least everybody of the virtuous. He was a bad example, the son of BELL, the snake under the palmetto tree and now or formerly on the dispensary whiskey bottle; he was a local optimist crying out futilely in a desert of the dry; professors looked askance at him, newspapers sniffed at him; he was a wolf in among the tender lambs, and as objectionable as JOE CANNON or the original horned devil whom JOSEPHUS has succeeded.

Mr. BLEASE's record is black, he has been accused, and we believe found guilty, of "plagiarism," of a speech or an essay of course; priggish of the

principles of other folks is honorable, illustrious, almost religious.

Personally we shall forgive the Hon. COLE BLEASE's "plagiarism." Where would SHAKESPEARE and the rest of the brethren be if borrowing were to be scrutinized too narrowly? On his looks too we might have to vote for Mr. BLEASE. He has the air of a Provincial pirate who is also a fêbtre and plays the guitar. His foes denounce him for wearing a "jim spranger" coat. Our imperfect acquaintance with the South Carolina dialect prevents us from appreciating this crime to the full extent of its enormity.

Caleb Powers.

The success of CALIB POWERS in the Republican primary in the Eleventh Congress district of Kentucky is not at all surprising. He was a promising young politician when elected Secretary of State in 1899 on the Republican ticket with Attorney-General W. S. TAYLOR, candidate for Governor, by a plurality of more than 2,000. In the ten years since the murder of WILLIAM GOEBEL, the Democratic nominee for Governor, who made a contest and was declared elected by a partisan Legislature, the four trials of CALIB POWERS for complicity in the crime, his convictions on perjured testimony and sentences to life imprisonment and death, and his pardon by Governor WILLSON, had convinced impartial men that he was a victim of political persecution and had lifted him to the plane of martyrdom, thus providing him with a platform if he desired to be a candidate for office.

When POWERS was released from prison the subject of politics was nauseous to him, for he had suffered as few men have done; and he said he was satisfied with the vindication that had come to him. But that state of mind soon passed. He was still an object of partisan hatred and malediction. It was quite natural that he should crave the larger vindication of popular suffrage and honorable service; and he would have been less or more than human if he had not sought to revenge himself, within the law at least, upon those men who had joined in the hue and cry against him and enlisted in the prosecution to send him to the scaffold.

With all his self-restraint and strength of character CALIB POWERS is vindictive, if he had not been so in the beginning, his cruel experience would have made him so. The first man to feel his resentment was Captain BEN R. GOLDEN, a candidate for Commonwealth Attorney, who had been active in the legal proceedings against POWERS and who was a brother of WHARTON GOLDEN, a "star witness" for the prosecution. In his campaign for Commonwealth Attorney, Captain GOLDEN had the support of the Hon. DON CALVIN EDWARDS, Representative in Congress from the Eleventh, a mountain district and the Republican stronghold in Kentucky. POWERS, by his remarkable energy and great natural eloquence, compassed the defeat of GOLDEN and then intimated that he would square accounts with EDWARDS, who is a native of Iowa. POWERS then became a candidate for the Republican nomination for Congress in opposition to EDWARDS, who had been elected in 1908 by a plurality of 21,344. The Democratic vote in the district is light. If POWERS could win in the primary he would take the seat of EDWARDS at Washington, since the Republican nomination is equivalent to election. On Tuesday last, after a campaign marked by many personal encounters between the two men, POWERS won by a narrow margin.

More than ten years have passed since WILLIAM GOEBEL, walking by the side of Colonel JACK CHINN in the shadow of the State House at Frankfort, was fatally wounded by a bullet fired from a window of the office of the Secretary of State. GOEBEL took the oath as Governor on his deathbed. Attorney-General TAYLOR, elected Governor on the face of the returns, feared for his life, and fled to Indiana to seek sanctuary under a Republican administration. All the legal machinery of Kentucky was for many years in operation to detect and punish the assassin. Yet to this day he remains unknown to the people of the State. HENRY E. YOTTSEY, stenographer, who tried to involve CALIB POWERS and whose testimony convicted JIM HOWARD, a mountaineer, of the crime, is serving a life term as an accomplice. HOWARD as well as POWERS was pardoned by Governor WILLSON two years ago, after it had become patent to honest men that both of them had been convicted on political evidence by biased juries. That YOTTSEY was mixed up in the plot there is not any reason to doubt, but there is no light on the central mystery of the assassination. There has been no more celebrated case in the American courts, and none more dramatic in some of its features.

The curse of WILLIAM GOEBEL's murder, himself a man who had taken human life, has lain heavily on Kentucky. Many persons connected with the case have died sudden or violent deaths. It has divided families and engendered feuds that may endure for generations. It will be the means of elevating CALIB POWERS to the plane of martyrdom, and the Congress of the United States, and thereby fresh and vivid life will be given to the bitter controversy. The crime was political, the persecution was political, and the sinister legacy of it all will be political. Kentucky is to be deeply commemorated.

The Great Moral Show.

The defeat at the primaries of a remarkably able and experienced Representative in Congress like the Hon. HENRY SHERMAN BOUTWELL of Chicago, the narrow escape of the Hon. GEORGE EDWIN FOSB of Chicago, a man of similar undoubted ability and distinction, the attempt of a child from the Outlook office to beat the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; these and many other instances serve to illustrate the angular state of many Republican minds and the shrewdness of many Republicans.

offense gratifying or trying to gratify their itch for place. The underlying principles of the great moral show now in progress seem to be these:

1. Mr. CANNON is Original Sin, and anybody who voted for him committed the unpardonable sin.

2. Insurgency is the crime of the Out who wants to get inside.

In watching this great moral show we are reminded somehow of that citizen who was told when he asked President WASHINGTON for a job that he had abused that President viciously and violently. "Oh, I meant nothing; I thought it was popular," was the ingenious reply.

The millions who have missed General SAMBO HOWARD's pastoral on the editorial page of the Springfield Republican will be partially and temporarily consoled by his country, clothed in scarlet and singing coat, on the outside page. As the writer of what may be called business verse of occasion he is not unworthy of the other and perhaps prouder laurels he has won so long. For example, his charming little address "To Political Business Men":

The Politician is surprised
 At what's been done in Maine.
 And everywhere you hear it talked
 Right over and over again.
 There's one thing more important, though,
 Here in our midst to-day.
 And that is, don't you think you ought
 To rent of S. P. A.?

"Talk Cook With Me" is one of the sweetest lyrics since "Drink to Me Only With Thine Eyes." "If Mount Tom Was Formed of a Giant's Bones" has the massiveness of basalt, but there is a simplicity, however artful and artistic, that endears this lovely lay to amateurs:

Scallops, Large Green Smelts, Spanish Mackerel,
 Large Fresh Mackerel, Bluefish.
 This is the Last Week of PEACHES.

Yet many will prefer the mystical, haunting, mysterious, melodious ripple and murmur of this other little masterpiece.

DICK
 LAW IS OF THE 15th
 We have the proper guns and shells. Waterproof coats, vests and pants.

Is there anything in "Kuhla Khan" that breathes more air from the vale of magical dark mysteries?

Visitors to Saint Peter's at Rome now have the opportunity of seeing, without trouble the monuments that are preserved under the old church whose place has been taken by the edifice that BRAMANTE and MICHELANGELO reared. The crypts could be visited before only by special permission, but Pope PIUS X. has had them cleaned up, lighted by electricity, and thrown open to the public, which now can judge for itself the works of art they contain. These have been described recently by Dr. E. STEINMANN, a German antiquarian.

More than three hundred Popes were buried under the older church, and one Holy Roman Emperor, Otto II. His monument was destroyed when the new church was built, and his remains lie in a later tomb with a porphyry top. Near him is the first German Pope, his cousin BENEDICT of Toul, who took the name GREGORY V. in an early Christian sarcophagus. Pope ADRIAN IV., NICHOLAS BREAKSPER, the only Englishman that ever sat in Peter's chair, is here, enclosed in a pagan Roman sarcophagus, which is adorned with masks and ox heads and garlands of fruit. There too lies BONIFACE VIII., the last of the great Popes that fought for the supremacy of Church over State, in a tomb fashioned by ARNOLFO DI CAMBIO, the architect of the Florence Duomo.

The crypts are full of monuments and sculpture of the early Renaissance and the period preceding, which can now for the first time be examined and studied satisfactorily.

By a simple arithmetical calculation it can be shown the exact year when there will be more men than women on earth. It will be gradually approaching with the decrease of youth near proximity to a nation of madmen. In that world it is said that now for the first time the not far distant future. The Roman race is considering. For FOMES WISS has just been elected.

Dr. FORNER WISLWOLF must have been studying the "New Nationalism" and the Insurgent movement.

In Mr. GRAMME-WHITE's egg throwing experiment from his aeroplane at a height of 1,000 feet it made no difference whether the ammunition was fresh or stale—nothing was seen of the eggs after they were dropped by the destroyer of the imaginary battleship. The judges' raincoats escaped the bombardment also. An inspection of the field discovered no yolks, no shells. What was the mystery of the Quantum Leap? What had become of the eggs that GRAMME-WHITE dropped? Major H. C. WILSON of the United States Coast Artillery was delighted. Apparently neither warship nor fortification had anything to fear from the enemy's aeroplanes. We suppose that the mystery will never be cleared up, but suggest experiments in dropping eggs from considerable heights to determine whether they do not burst before reaching the ground. Perhaps the scientific men may be equal to the problem.

New Nationalist Explanation of the Defiance of the Courts by the Newspapers.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: Sir—You make your readers grin at and not with you when you tell them that Judge Cullen has dismissed the case of the children who ran over the land and that the people are delighted to have in F. R. a spokesman for this feeling.

The newspapers are much because they fear the displeasure of Judge Cullen who has just decided that libel suits against them.

FATHERLY SUN READER.
 New York, September 15.

The Scott-Greely Ward Sisters.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: The quotation in to-day's SUN from the photograph letter of Gustavine to Field only shows that Gustavine did not quite General Scott correctly. Scott said "depart in peace," as Greely also did, who made the same remark to many of his friends, myself among them.

C. L. I.
 New York, September 11.

Union at the Water's Edge.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: Sir, it is not true for women to unite and refuse to be robbed of their personal effects in order that their money may be squandered by politicians.

New York, September 10. C. M. O'NEILL.

The Popular Occupation.

He has set his business order.
 Left it wholly to a differ.
 He's not in his children's corner.
 He has got no time for chatter.

Not more causes he is giving.
 For the increased cost of living.
 And we do not find him chinning.
 Why the home team isn't winning.

He is doing no explaining.
 To account for late detaining.
 He's not in the children's corner.
 For the fish he failed to capture.

These are worth but little mention.
 Greedy things have his attention.
 He spends all his time inventing.
 Reasons why Maine went well-being.

McLendon Wilson.

THE RURAL REVOLT.

LE ROY, Sept. 16.—Two years ago when the debate over the wisdom of renominating Governor Hughes was at its height I "drove" Genesee county and from door to door asked the inhabitants of this rural county for their opinions. Almost without exception the opinions expressed by these farmers indicated the reasons why a renomination was necessary.

Of the reasons thus expressed proved to be general enough among Republicans all over the State to control at Saratoga. To-day I repeated the drive, and the conclusions here set forth are based upon the frank statements of these farmers.

First among these conclusions is the interesting fact that so far as Genesee county is concerned the direct primary is indorsed, championed, demanded by a surprisingly large percentage of farmers. Of the dozen or two with whom I talked at least half were earnest advocates of the Governor's policy. Several of them made it a condition to their indorsement of the Republican ticket. All agreed that it was a measure which commanded the general and strong support of the Republican farmers.

Second in the list of opinions was that familiar elsewhere, that the Republican party would be defeated at the State election. It is difficult to set forth all the reasons upon which the opinion was founded. Men talked of the Alida case, of the direct nominations struggle, but generally there was a common agreement that the time for change had come.

"I shall vote for any good Democrat," was a statement made by several who said that it would be their first Democratic vote.

Equally frequent was the comment, "I believe that the time has come for a change. In the Alida case, in the Bell case we have learned something; there must be more to learn. It is time to clean house."

To the question as to whether a "progressive" victory at Saratoga would change the Republican prospects there were various answers. On the whole the more independent in political thought the speaker showed himself to be the more satisfied he was that there was no palliative in convention action. Over and over again there was expressed the stubborn conviction that the unrest, the dissatisfaction among Republicans had become too intense to be placated. Not matter for discussion, not a subject for debate, but a very general conviction based on the cause of personal rather than public policy, this belief in the coming Republican overthrow seemed to be.

It should not be understood that every farmer was in revolt. That was not the case. A good third were prepared to continue a lifelong habit of voting in the Republican column; but each of these knew a neighbor down the road or over the hill who was dissatisfied and talking treason.

"John Smith says he won't vote for a damn man on the Republican ticket," said it right there where you are standing, with several other people listening. This was a statement heard frequently in loyal Republican dooryards.

The attitude toward Mr. Roosevelt here expressed was on the whole the most surprising detail of this experience. Mr. Roosevelt here manifested a total and complete lack of sympathy for the party more of his old time admiration here than in the cities; yet if Genesee county is a sample, the Roosevelt reaction noted in Rochester is not less real in Le Roy.

"I like Roosevelt, I have always voted for him; but I think this time he has gone a little too far." This was an opinion expressed by several.

Here is another quote as frequently heard:

"About Mr. Roosevelt's Western speeches we don't know; they are something to be thought about, but don't you think yourself that they are a bit extreme. Gone a little far, hasn't he?"

Leaving over the stone wall, pitchfork in hand, one sturdy old farmer with the stage complement of rural whiskers summed it up even more decisively. He said:

"I have voted for Roosevelt for every office for which he has been a candidate, but he has had every office the American people can give him and I think he ought to step aside now."

In general these farmers all expressed sympathy with past performances of the ex-President, but with his recent utterances it was clear they had vastly less sympathy. The explosions at Denver and Oswatimie had unpleasant echoes on the hills of Genesee. Summed up briefly, the unmistakable notion was that he had "gone too far." In a word, for the Roosevelt leadership there was no enthusiasm, no notion that it would solve party troubles and save a threatened party. On the contrary, everywhere there was insoluble and the party not to be saved from defeat by any leadership, or by any new platform declarations.

Equally apparent, however, was the fact that in this section of rural New York no sympathy was felt for the old guard. The party control exercised by Barnes, Aldridge and Woodruff is as unpopular as the new gospel of Roosevelt is, in fact, more obviously so. The control of the Republican State convention by the old guard would be tremendously unpopular among the Republican voters of Genesee. The declaration against direct primaries will be the signal for open slaughter in Genesee; but the control by Grison and Greiner quite as obviously will fail utterly to bring back estranged Republicans.

Here in Le Roy, as in Rochester and Buffalo, Republicans are the chief boomers for Mayor GAYNOR. The Mayor of New York city and no other Democratic aspirant for the nomination occupies the thoughts of Republicans in this district. Several affirmed frankly that they would vote for him. Practically every Republican with whom I talked conceded his election.

"The State of New York will follow the example of Maine," this was apparently a settled conviction among not a few.

For the first time in twenty-eight years Genesee county has a Democratic Assemblyman. His election is chargeable to the disapproval in this region of the attitude of his predecessor upon the direct primaries. At least a few Republicans believe that the sitting Democrat will be re-elected, but such events would inevitably carry with it a political upheaval not seen in a State election here in a generation at least.

So far as one may generalize upon the evidence here supplied, a large fraction of the better class of rural Republicans, that is, of the more intelligent, has decided from reading recent political history that the time has come when it is wiser to turn the Republican party out of power. Legislative scandals explain a part; the local issue has its place, the Roosevelt eruption has contributed, but it is not one simple evil that can be cured, not one issue on which the Republican party can change front and retain the rural voter.

On the contrary, it is a long standing, deep seated dissatisfaction, such as may be discerned behind the results in the recent election in Maine.

The hold of Governor Hughes upon these farmers is unmistakable. His popularity here exceeds that of Mr. Roosevelt. His "policies," that is his direct primary measures, command a support denied the Rooseveltian "Nationalism," which to speak accurately seems here a danger, not a blessing bestowed upon a doctrine not understood, but unmistakably distrusted.

"I wish we could vote for Governor Hughes again," said several persons whose admiration for the present Governor was not to be mistaken.

Of Republican candidates for Governor hardly a word was spoken. The most ardent Roosevelt champion in the day's journey suggested William Loeb, "if Mr. Roosevelt will not run himself"; but this was absolutely the only name. As for the Democratic side, a single mention of James S. Havens was the only break in the universal Gaynor talk. Candidates, at least, do not interest Republicans in Genesee at the present moment, nor have they any choice whose nomination would command support or evoke enthusiasm.

Looking back over the day's drive the thing that actually stands out is the astonishing unanimity with which Republicans forecast Republican defeat and the utter absence of regret with which they accept its coming. Hardly less interesting is the absence of any general agreement on the reason. Two years ago these same farmers proclaimed that they would refuse to support the Republican ticket if Governor Hughes were not renominated. His renomination, however, they all conceded would meet any grievance they had. To-day they make no condition. They are simply convinced that, as more than one said, "It is time there was a change in the State Government at Albany; it is time that the Republican party went out."

A day in this section of rural New York contributes more to making it easy to understand why all experienced Republican politicians in the up-State district expect defeat than any month of study of State or national issues. Tariff, the Alida case, houses, all these doubts have had their part in creating the situation; but the situation seems larger than any one of these causes. It seems more like a widespread, determined and fairly self-contained dissatisfaction. Such evidence as I have been able to collect in rural and city districts is far too slight to warrant any broad generalization; but such as it is it confirms all that the politicians on the Republican side are privately predicting for November.

Save for a few followers of Greiner in the Erie machine, I have not in nearly two weeks met a single Republican who expected to see his party win in the November election. All the doubt, all the apprehension, all the conservatism is among the Democrats. They see favorable signs everywhere at hand, but their caution in accepting them, their doubt as to their value, is almost humorous when set over against the Republican readiness to concede everything and admit cheerfully that all is lost.

So far as Rochester and the rural districts I have visited are concerned, there is not the slightest evidence that the victory of the old guard or of the New Nationalism at Saratoga will seriously affect the results in November. In the cities a Roosevelt victory will send the conservative and business elements to the Democratic ticket; it will send to that ticket the independents who hate the old guard but quite as frankly admit their distrust of the New Nationalists. As for an old guard victory, its effect with the added grievance of a defeat of all direct primary platform pledges will complete the dissatisfaction of a thoroughly disaffected rural Republican constituency. The foregoing conclusions are based upon the evidence submitted in this correspondence. They are precisely the conclusions which have been reached by the Republicans of these districts.

As for the compromise feared by the Democrats, which will reconcile Republican factions and placate Republican voters, I have not yet met a single Republican who has suggested any way by which it could be attained. Superficially at least the Republican campaign this fall appears formidable only to Democrats, whose memories not unreasonably restrain their optimism.

ATOMOBILE HORNS.

Is the Ear Protecting Variety Necessary to Protect the Public?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN: Sir, Mr. William J. Allen in a letter in the SUN of September 15 upon harsh and discordant automobile horns says they are necessary to attract attention, and gives an instance in which his own little girl was hurt by the noise of an automobile horn. I am sure that the horn of an approaching automobile is a necessary evil.

It seems to me that if children are allowed to play in the middle of the street with so little care of themselves as is so often the case, they would very soon become equally careless of others. No noise could be invented to startle them. Apparently the newness of the horrible horn which Mr. Allen describes is at present to the ears of children as a new and novel sound, but as soon as its novelty has passed and newer and louder noises must be found, until the world has become intolerable to old people, the horns will be very ill, and even to people of average refinement, for refinement undoubtedly does increase the general sensitiveness of organization and distill of harsh sounds.

The real question seems to be not whether the horns are a necessary evil, but whether the drivers of automobiles should persist in flying through the streets at high speed, refusing to slow up or turn one foot to either side when bearing down upon pedestrians. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so often written to the editors of newspapers. The driver described by Mr. Allen seems to have deliberately charged a crowd of children who he must have seen, were paying no attention to him. Why did he not stop? Because chauffeurs are unwilling to interrupt their work, the public suffer. There are more of us who do not own automobiles than there are who do. Why have we no right to safety in the streets and comparative quiet in our homes?

Mr. Allen's letter is a good example of the kind of letter which is so